



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,015	07/03/2003	Xuelu Zou	024705-121	5460

7590 03/29/2004
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

GROUP, KARL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,015	Applicant(s) ZOU, XUELU	
	Examiner Karl E Group	Art Unit 1755	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37,38,42,46-49,53-55,59-63,67-70,74-77 and 81-84 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 47,48,54,55,60-63,68-70,75-77 and 82-84 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,74 and 81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/610,687.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-3-03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,74,81 are, drawn to a substrate having a specific surface roughness, classified in class 428, subclass 694st.
- II. Claims 47,48,49,54,55,60-63,68-70,75-77,82-84, drawn to an enstatite glass ceramic, classified in class 501, subclass 4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions different effects.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with George Lesmes on March 3, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,74,81. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 47,48,49,54,55,60-63,68-70,75-77,82-84 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 59 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 59 "the content of titanate" lacks antecedent basis in claim 37 because a titanate phase is not defined.

Claim 67 "quarts" should be "quartz". The specification should also be corrected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1755

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 37,42,46,67,74,81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as being anticipated by Goto et al (6,245,411).

See example 3, table 1, showing an enstatite containing glass ceramic with a surface roughness of 8 angstroms. The properties of the dependent claims are considered inherent in the composition taught by Goto et al. Furthermore, claim 46 fails to set forth the temperature range for the thermal expansion and cannot be compared to the taught thermal expansion.

6. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nakajima et al (6,503,857;6,429,160).

Nakajima et al teach a glass ceramic substrate including enstatite and a titanate, see examples 1-3,6 and surface roughness within the instant claims. Products of identical compositions may not have mutually exclusive properties.

It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

7. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Art Unit: 1755

8. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Goto et al (6,344,423).

Goto et al teach a crystallized glass ceramic substrate including enstatite and having a surface roughness less than 10 angstroms, see examples. Although a quartz solid solution is included in the exemplified compositions, it is clear from the disclosure of Goto et al that quartz is an optional component (column 3, lines 55-60. Furthermore "substantially no quartz" of claim 67 allows for the crystal phase to be present.

It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

9. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese documents 11278865 and 11278864, each taken alone.

The Japanese documents teach an enstatite glass ceramic composition having a surface roughness less than 10 angstroms. The limitation "substantially no ZnO" is not considered to exclude ZnO from the instant claims.

The claims are considered anticipated or in the alternative the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed by the prior art because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obvious, see In re Malagari, 182 U.S.P.Q 549.

Art Unit: 1755

10. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

11. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese documents 200016918 and 2000169186, each taken alone.

See abstracts for enstatite glass ceramics including the claimed surface roughness and properties of the dependent claims.

12. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

13. Claims 37,38,42,53,74,81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zou et al (6,294,490)

The applied reference has a common assignee and inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

14. Claims 37,38,42,53,74,81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zou et al (6,627,565)

Art Unit: 1755

The applied reference has a common assignee and inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

16. Claims 37,38,42,53,74,81 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,565. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the patented claims and the instant claims overlap.

17. Claims 37,38,42,53,74,81 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S.

Art Unit: 1755

Patent No. 6,294,490. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the patented claims and the instant claims overlap.

18. Claims 37,38,42,46,53,59,67,79,81 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,627,566. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the instant claims and the patented claims overlap.

Conclusion


19. Applicants are requested to amend the continuing data in the disclosure to update the status.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl E Group whose telephone number is 571-272-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on 571-272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1755

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Karl E Group
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755

Keg
3-19-04